



ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1876.

"A Democratic newspaper sums up the Democratic canvass for the Presidency in this sentence:—''We need only fifty-four votes to elect the next President.''' This calculation is based upon the theory that all the Southern States will vote the Democratic ticket at the next election. Even in Louisiana and South Carolina, where the negroes are so numerous and where the Republicans should certainly expect to have a majority, this result is almost conceded. It would not be wise, perhaps, to enter into all the causes of this radical and in some respects unnatural change in the political temper of the South. But it is a calamity. It presents two sections of the Union one against the other, as before the war. When the war was over it was the hope of every patriot, North and South, that all sectionalism had been buried in the bloody fields of Virginia and Mississippi; that there would never again be a Presidential contest with one section arrayed against another; but now, in the third canvass since the close of the war, we enter upon the fight with the South a unit, and with no hope of breaking that unit. It would be a blessing to our politics if this Southern question were to be eliminated, and we had issues which would appeal to us as Americans and patriots, and not as citizens of one section or another. We see no such prospect, and can only wait and hope." So says the New York Herald, and yet that same paper, not a month ago, because a sheriff with a posse, composed alike of whites and blacks, had to resort to force in Louisiana to arrest a party of negro murderers, denounced the whole South as being still rebellious, and its people so filled with hatred to the negroes that they shot them down like dogs. How can the South be other than a unit against Radicalism, when, ever since the war, the chief purpose of leaders of the Radical party, always excepting the enraging one of pillaging from the public purse, has been to insult and degrade her and her representatives; when the newspapers of the North, even those like the Herald, professing to be independent, either to gratify an ill-concealed dislike for the people of the South, or because they find it beneficial to their own interests, seize upon every breach of the peace south of the Potomac and distort it into the outcropping of a rebellious spirit which, too cowardly to attempt open and organized resistance to the laws of the country, seeks the pusillanimous method of manifesting its baffled malignity by slaughtering inefficient negroes; and when, worse still, the hatred entertained by the victorious North for the conquered South—and which may be regarded as the tribute every pays to acknowledged superiority—is such a pervading emotion in the Northern States that unprincipled, but shrewd demagogues like Senator Morton and ex-Speaker Blaine excite it by bloody threats, and feed it from the Adversary's graves to increase their popularity? When a different policy is pursued toward the South, when her representatives in Congress are accorded equal privileges and courtesy with those from the North, and not daily taunted with being rebels, when the Federal offices in the South are filled by honest and respectable citizens of the country, and not by ignorant negroes and cunning strangers, and when the true assertions of the Southern people that they abide by the result of the war are not derided and discredited, then, probably, the South will not be a unit.

It is understood that Rev. Dr. Randolph has determined to decline the professorship lately offered him at the Virginia Episcopal Theological Seminary.

Foreign News.

NEW YORK, June 7.—Intelligence reached here yesterday of the escape of the Fenian prisoners confined in western Australia. It seems the plan for their escape was organized here, where the necessary money was raised, and an agent was sent out to manage the affair. The escape is stated to have been effected in an American ship, the Catalpa. There were only seven men in actual confinement, but there were nine others living in western Australia on tickets of leave. Whether all escaped or not of course remains to be seen.

LONDON, June 7.—A Vienna dispatch to the Times says the united efforts of the Powers might still succeed in making Servia respect an armistice if one was concluded with the insurgents.

Prince Gortchakoff's recent telegram cautioning Prince Milan of Serbia seems to be without effect. A Berlin dispatch to the Times says the Tsar, the organ of the Serbian Cabinet, declares that war is unavoidable now that the Turk has triumphed and the programme of the Northern Powers been rejected. The official Russian Invalids says the insurgents are not likely to accept an armistice.

PARIS, June 7.—The health of M. Casimir Perier is improving. The King of Geo. Soud's health is precarious.

LONDON, June 7.—The State of Greece, who was sick at Copenhagen with a severe attack of catarrh, felt recovered.

The Queen Dowager Josephine, of Sweden, is dead.

Lord Northbrook, late Governor General of India, has been created an Earl.

Considerable uneasiness has been created at Berlin by the sudden return of Prince Bismarck from Launceberg for protracted conferences with the Emperor. The uneasiness is increased by the announcement that the Emperor's departure for Bismarck is postponed. Rumor connects these events with certain exaggerated claims made on Germany for support by Russia in her Eastern policy, which Prince Bismarck is not inclined to sanction.

The Cologne Gazette and the Berlin Tribune deprecate a too close adherence to the views of Russia.

AGUSA, June 7.—Intelligence received here from Slavonic sources states that Prince Karagorjevic's legions defeated the Turks in the vicinity of Cakooko, in Bosnia, on the 3d of June, killing 160 men. On the following day 2,300 Turks capitulated.

Many insurgents have petitioned Austria to grant them an asylum, alleging that if they are refused they are in danger of starvation.

GEN. HUNTON'S SPEECH.

In the account of the exciting scene in the U. S. House of Representatives, published in yesterday's Gazette, a synopsis, merely, of what Gen. Hunton, the able Representative from this district, said, was given. The following is the full text of his speech:

Mr. Hunton. I desire, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee to whom attention has been frequently made in the statement of the gentleman from Maine, to detain the House to make a short statement of the matters to which he has alluded, and I trust that in doing this I shall speak as a member of the committee, and tell calmly, dispassionately, fairly, what has occurred before that subcommittee of which the gentleman from Maine complains.

I beg leave to say in advance that the House has witnessed this morning a remarkable, not to say an unexampled scene, a scene which may have its example in the history of legislation, but if so, it has escaped my observation and reading on the subject.

During the present session of this House two resolutions were adopted, each of which ordered an investigation, each of which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, and each of which was referred to a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Ashe of North Carolina, Mr. Lawrence of Ohio, and myself as chairman of the committee, and before the committee has finished the taking of testimony, before that committee has reached a conclusion, an effort is made by the gentleman supposed to be mostly concerned in these investigations to take the consideration of these investigations from the organ of the House and to put them in the hands of the members of the House. I need not remind the House what sort of a report would come from that committee if it were allowed to be made by the gentleman from Maine. But I say that after this House has ordered an investigation and has committed that investigation to a committee of the House it is not only unexampled, but entirely against legislative proceedings for a gentleman to rise and undertake to anticipate what the conclusion of that committee shall be and to state what the action of that committee has been.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the action of this committee, I will endeavor to follow some of the points made by the gentleman from Maine, and if I state any of the facts wrong I hope either of the gentlemen of that committee will correct me, because I desire to state nothing but what is accurately true in the statement I shall submit to the House.

The first point made by the gentleman from Maine was that it very soon was discovered that the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Tarbox] was aimed at him, although his name was not mentioned in the resolution, and that he learned this from the proceedings of the subcommittee.

I beg to say to the House that the subcommittee and its chairman first learned from the gentleman from Maine that he was the man aimed at. He does not forget that after the resolution of Mr. Tarbox was referred to the subcommittee at his instance I had an interview with him in the committee room of the Committee on Ways and Means, and in that interview the gentleman from Maine spoke of it as a resolution affecting him. Not only that, as he expressed himself satisfied and pleased with the personnel of the subcommittee, although two of them were confederates. And at the instance of the gentleman from Maine a day was appointed upon which the subcommittee was to enter upon its duties. And yet he tells this House that he learned from the subcommittee that he was the party to be investigated, and not the Union Pacific Railroad, as set out in the resolution of Mr. Tarbox. The first I heard either from a member of the House or a member of the committee on the subject was from the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Blaine] himself, that the resolution referred to him, and he wanted the investigation commenced on a given day, and proceeded with, with as much dispatch as possible from that day. I told the gentleman from Maine that the investigation I should undertake should be as kindly as I could make it, and it should be as fairly conducted as I could conduct it, but as thoroughly as it could possibly be.

I begged to his wish that the investigation should not commence until a day not very distant in the future, I think about ten days off. The reason why he did not want the investigation to begin at once was that he wanted to go to Philadelphia during what is known as the Centennial week, and did not want the investigation to commence until the following week. This request was granted with a great deal of pleasure, and on the very day indicated by him, the very day he requested the investigation to begin, it was begun, and from that day to this there has been no hour that the committee could devote to this investigation that has not been devoted to it, except when the gentleman himself prevented it, and I say that more than two weeks' time has been lost to this committee because of the conduct of the gentleman from Maine; I do not mean to attach any blame to him; the first was the postponement until the week after the Centennial, and the next was a week of indisposition on his part, and even this morning I rose at the hour of four o'clock to come to this city, a distance of sixty miles, to renew the investigation and get through with it as soon as possible. The gentleman from Maine and his friends were not present, and the investigation had to be postponed. And yet he tells this House that the investigation is "prolonged, prolonged, prolonged," and seeks to make the impression on the House that it is the purpose of the committee to prolong this investigation for some sinister purpose. Why he might just as well have said that we desired to postpone it until after the 14th of June, and every member of the committee will bear witness to every word I say that the committee labored in season and out of season; sitting on one occasion nearly the entire day in order to get through with this investigation before the 14th day of June, and every delay that has occurred, every day when the committee was not able to be in session, it was either because the gentleman from Maine was absent or requested an adjournment. I will not say "every day," for it is possible that there were one or two days when we had a meeting of the full committee, or something of that kind. But the delay has been at his instance, has been caused by him; for this subcommittee has worked as I say on other subcommittees of this House has ever worked. So much for the prolonging of this investigation.

I had no desire, God knows, to prolong it. I had no desire to enter upon it; but it was a duty imposed upon me by the House, and I intended to discharge every such duty here, with fairness, impartiality, and a due regard to my duty to the House of Representatives. But the gentleman says that when we had been examining witnesses under what is known as the Tarbox resolution, to his surprise he found that I claimed, or the committee claimed, that they had jurisdiction to investigate certain Pacific railroads, and that he was to be involved in the investigation of those Pacific railroads as well as under the Tarbox resolution. Now, the gentleman cannot have forgotten what occurred in that connection; and, not having forgotten it, it was his duty in fairness to have stated it to this House. He knows that this resolution of Mr. Luttrell's of California, directing an investigation into all the Pacific railroads that had received subsidies from the Government, was alluded to almost from the start of the investigation by the subcommittee; therefore he could not have been surprised if the least to learn in the last day or two that there was to be an investigation under the Luttrell resolution.

I desire to state specifically what occurred on this subject a day or two ago in the committee room. I was asked, "Is there to be an investigation under this Luttrell resolution?" I said to Mr. Blaine, "The resolution will require an investigation that will take months at the hands of this committee. You have expressed a desire that a full investigation touching you shall be done speedily and concluded as soon as possible. If you desire it, I will not take up any other road except the Northern Pacific and the Kansas Pacific, because as to these two railroads your name has been mentioned as involved in an unpleasant way; and for your sake, that you may get a report before the tedious examinations of the affairs of all these Pacific railroads, we will take up first the matter which touches you, if you desire it." Mr. Blaine said that he desired us to go on.

Yet he is very much surprised after all these things occurred in the committee room. He is surprised to find that an investigation is to be undertaken by this subcommittee which involves an examination in these specific railroads, and it is to be prolonged, prolonged, prolonged, when we agreed for his sake and at his instance to skip all the other inquiries under the Luttrell resolution, until we had disposed of those which seemed to attach to Mr. Blaine.

Mr. Frye. Will my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. Hunton] allow me to ask him a question in relation to that which he has just mentioned.

Mr. Hunton. Certainly.

Mr. Frye. Did not Mr. Blaine, in that last conversation, object that under the resolution the committee had no jurisdiction of a stock transaction between two individuals?

Mr. Hunton. Is that your only question?

Mr. Frye. Yes.

Mr. Hunton. I will answer it. I think it very likely he did. And I think also that if we had left the question of jurisdiction to Mr. Blaine there would have been a great many questions ruled out. [Laughter.] But the committee had to decide the question of jurisdiction for themselves, and they decided that they had jurisdiction to go on.

Mr. Frye. I will ask you—

Mr. Hunton. I do not desire to be interrupted any further, if the gentleman will excuse me.

Mr. Frye. Very well.

Mr. Hunton. I say that there was no ground for the surprise of the gentleman, and instead of bad faith on the part of this committee in undertaking this investigation into the affairs of the Pacific railroads, it was our bounden duty as the organ of the House to undertake it, and to do what we could, whether we got through this session or not. And for the purpose of bringing to a close the matters which seemed to bear upon Mr. Blaine—and this House and the country knows that there have been publications which drew from him certain once if not twice a personal explanation on this floor—for the purpose of getting at them speedily and getting a report into this House as soon as we could, I said: "If you wish, Mr. Blaine, we will not go into all these other roads, but take up the Northern Pacific Road and the Kansas Pacific Road, because there is connected with those two roads a charge against you. Now, if there is anything unfair in that, I cannot see it, and I guarantee that this House cannot see it."

Then about these letters; and that I believe is the gist of his complaint before this House. In order to get that question before the House properly, I desire to state it as it arose in the committee room on the evidence. And I beg leave to state here, before I go from this point, that every witness that has been examined before that committee, whether his testimony was made in favor of Mr. Blaine or against him, was summoned by the committee without any suggestion from Mr. Blaine or any of his friends. He did on one occasion send me a memorandum of witnesses to summon, and my reply on the back of the memorandum was that every one of those witnesses had already been summoned, or were ordered to be summoned by the Sergeant-at-Arms. Therefore, the committee, under either resolution, was summoned by the committee without any suggestion from Mr. Blaine or any of his friends.

Among these witnesses appeared Mr. James Mulligan, of the city of Boston, a gentleman whose character is unimpeached, and according to the testimony, unimpeachable. Mr. Fisher was put on the stand to state some things differently from Mr. Mulligan, and he was asked the question: "What sort of a man is James Mulligan?" He was put on the stand by Mr. Blaine, and, after his examination in chief had ended, he was asked this question. His reply was substantially, if not literally: "He is as good as any man I ever knew, or the best man I ever knew." Mr. Atkins, another witness, introduced for the same purpose, said substantially the same thing of Mr. Mulligan. I desire to say to this House in the beginning of this investigation that had not been summoned by the committee, under either resolution, was summoned by the committee without any suggestion from Mr. Blaine or any of his friends.

Mr. Frye. Will my colleague on the committee pardon me one moment?

Mr. Hunton. Certainly.

Mr. Frye. From the gentleman's statement in relation to these questions as to the character of Mr. Mulligan, the impression might go out that Mr. Blaine asked those questions. Will the gentleman please state whether or not he, as chairman of the committee, asked them?

Mr. Hunton. I did, sir.

Mr. Frye. That is all.

Mr. Hunton. And the witness answered just as I have stated. I wanted to know what sort of a witness I was dealing with. I put the question for the information of the committee. This witness, who had been summoned from Boston, was put upon the stand, and I did not know what he would testify to. If anybody had ever informed me what Mr. Mulligan's testimony would be or what it would relate to I had forgotten it entirely. In the course of his examination the first day Mr. Mulligan was testifying very quietly; there was no excitement in the committee room at all when he happened to mention that he had in his possession certain letters written by Mr. Blaine to Warren Fisher, Jr. The mention of these letters seemed to have a remarkable effect upon Mr. Blaine, for in a moment or two afterward he whispered to Mr. Lawrence, the Republican member of that committee, "Move an adjournment." It so happened that I heard the suggestion. Mr. Lawrence got up with great solemnity on his countenance and said, "Mr. Chairman, I am very sick and I hope the committee will adjourn." [Laughter.]

Mr. Lawrence rose.

Mr. Hunton. I hope the gentleman is better to day.

Mr. Lawrence. Will my colleague on the committee allow me to ask a question or make a statement?

Mr. Hunton. Certainly.

Mr. Lawrence. I will ask my colleague whether, when I went into the committee room on that morning, the first thing I said to him before I had spoken to anybody else, was not that I had been exceedingly sick during the night? [Laughter.] I had been to Baltimore on the day before; and though I had not indulged in anything that would necessarily make me sick, yet I was extremely sick, so much so that it was with difficulty I sat there at all. I said simply what was true when I said that I was extremely unwell, and as the gentleman knows I have been quite unwell ever since. [Laughter.]

Mr. Frye. What time was it when it was proposed to adjourn?

Mr. Lawrence. It was then half-past twelve o'clock, half an hour beyond the time when the committee usually adjourns to attend the sittings of the House. Now, my friend says that he heard the remark of Mr. Blaine asking me to move to adjourn. It was not necessary

that I should state what Mr. Blaine had said to me.

Mr. Hunton. Nobody asked you to do so.

Mr. Lawrence. The gentleman says he heard it, but it was not necessary that I should state every ground for asking the adjournment.

Mr. Hunton. Certainly not.

Mr. Lawrence. It was sufficient that I deemed it necessary to ask an adjournment. [Laughter.]

Mr. Hunton. The gentleman has stated the matter exactly as it occurred. He did come in the morning sick.

Mr. Lawrence. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hunton. But he went to work in a most vigorous style for two hours.

Mr. Lawrence. But I became exhausted.

Mr. Hunton. When those letters were mentioned the gentleman became sick, and somebody else sicker. [Laughter.] And the motion to adjourn was made at his suggestion.

Mr. Lawrence. It ought to be said in justice to Mr. Blaine that so far as anything said by him to me could indicate his purpose, the motion to adjourn suggested by him was not caused by any fear of what was going on.

Mr. Hunton. I never intimated such a thing. The gentleman is raising a row of straw just to knock them over. But I say that after these things were mentioned incidentally by Mr. Mulligan, the reference being brought out without a question, [for I had not the remotest conception that he had any such letters in his possession], the gentleman from Ohio did rise, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine, and move an adjournment; and he put it upon the ground that he was sick, and we had been sitting over our time anyhow. These are the exact facts. Now, why the motion to adjourn was suggested to the gentleman, and whether he was absolutely taken sick at that moment, I cannot tell and do not propose to inquire; but an adjournment was had. We did not like to keep our colleague there in misery and distress; on account of his sickness and because we had sat over the hour which we were allowed to sit, an adjournment was had. The committee adjourned until the next morning at ten o'clock; and when we met, James Mulligan was put upon the stand again to complete his examination, which had been interrupted by the motion to adjourn. He was asked a question which did not look to the letters, which had no reference to them whatever. He said: "Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to answer that question, I desire to make a personal explanation painful to myself."

I will commence at the beginning of his personal explanation. I will state it substantially as he did, and I let it in any important particular I trust I will be corrected. Upon the evening of his first arrival in the city of Washington, before I knew he was in the city, he and Warren Fisher were waiting on by Mr. Blaine. They were invited to the house of Mr. Blaine. Mr. Mulligan said, "Mr. Blaine I decline to go to your house; I do not want to talk about what I have been brought here for. I desire to take the stand to-morrow untrammelled by conversation of any kind with anybody." Warren Fisher went to the house of Mr. Blaine. Twice Mr. Blaine sent a messenger down to inquire if Mulligan would come to his house. Mr. Mulligan declined, and presently Mr. Blaine and Warren Fisher came into the hotel where Mulligan stopped in the city of Washington, [the Riggs House.] Mr. Mulligan was in the barber-shop undergoing the pleasant operation of shaving, or about to undergo it, and Mr. Blaine followed him into the barber-shop and commenced to entreat and earnestly to request that Mulligan would give up those letters which Blaine had addressed to Warren Fisher. Mulligan declined to do it.

Mr. Frye. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman—

A member. I object to interruption.

Mr. Frye. I ask my colleague of the committee if I may interrupt him?

Mr. Hunton. Yes, you may.

Mr. Frye. The gentleman is now stating evidence, and I desire him to be very careful, because, as I remember it, there is no testimony whatever showing or tending to show that Mr. Blaine, in a barber-shop, in the presence of the barber, entreated Mulligan for those letters.

Mr. Hunton. It matters not where he entreated him. I am under the impression it was there, but I am not certain.

Mr. Frye. The letters were not read in any barber-shop.

Mr. Hunton. I will take him out of the barber-shop. It does not matter in the least where the entreaty was made. Mr. Blaine entreated him. I give you now the substance of the language of the witness. He entreated him with tears in his eyes, going down on his knees, or almost on his knees.

Mr. Frye. In the barber-shop?

Mr. Hunton. I did not say in the barber-shop. I did not care where it was. It was in his room, I believe; but he made this entreaty. The witness said, "With tears in his eyes, almost, if not quite, on his knees." "If you do not deliver those letters to me, I am ruined and my family disgraced." Of course I mean to be understood here that the witness meant that Blaine's family would be disgraced through the ruin of Mr. Blaine. He also threatened to commit suicide. Mr. Blaine refused to deliver the letters. He said: "Mr. Blaine, I see by the evening paper that my testimony given to the committee to-day is to be assailed"—to use his own word, "impugned"—"and in case my character and testimony are assailed, I want those letters to justify me in my testimony before the committee." Mr. Blaine asked: "Do you suppose I am going to assail you?" The witness said: "If you do not assail me others may, and my character is too dear to me not to defend it if I can." Mr. Blaine tried policy with him, and he moved that one letter which touched however remotely any subject under investigation, was to be the company by Tom Scott, or the Northern Pacific, or the Central Pacific, or all of the rest of those roads named in that resolution? Did he not testify in answer to your interrogatories at three different times that only one letter however remotely touched any matter which the subcommittee were investigating?

Mr. Hunton. No, sir; he did not testify, according to my recollection. I will tell you what he did testify.

Mr. Frye. Well, sir.

Mr. Hunton. He testified on one or two or perhaps on three occasions that he did not think that there were but two letters in the batch which bore upon the subject-matter of inquiry before the committee, one in regard to the Northern Pacific and the other in regard to the Union Pacific.

Mr. Frye. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hunton. That is what he said, but the committee thought that as the letter had been obtained in the manner in which Mr. Blaine had obtained these letters, it was not only their right but their duty to determine the question for themselves whether the letters were pertinent to the subject-matter of inquiry or not.

Mr. Frye. One other question. The gentleman says in response to my question that there were two letters, one relative to the Union and the other to the Northern Pacific Railroad. On the day before yesterday, when you were pursuing that Northern Pacific inquiry, did he not swear distinctly that there was not one letter which related to all to the Northern Pacific?

Mr. Hunton. He mentioned a statement which related to it.

Mr. Frye. A statement but not a letter, and that statement not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting.

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. Did he not state that the statement was not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting?

Mr. Hunton. I stated so.

Mr. Frye. One more question.

Mr. Hunton. I yield for one more.

Mr. Frye. Was there, when this witness was summoned to Washington, any subcommittee members at all?

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. A statement but not a letter, and that statement not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting.

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. Did he not state that the statement was not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting?

Mr. Hunton. I stated so.

Mr. Frye. One more question.

Mr. Hunton. I yield for one more.

Mr. Frye. Was there, when this witness was summoned to Washington, any subcommittee members at all?

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. A statement but not a letter, and that statement not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting.

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. Did he not state that the statement was not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting?

Mr. Hunton. I stated so.

Mr. Frye. One more question.

Mr. Hunton. I yield for one more.

Mr. Frye. Was there, when this witness was summoned to Washington, any subcommittee members at all?

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

Mr. Frye. A statement but not a letter, and that statement not in Mr. Blaine's handwriting.

Mr. Hunton. No, sir.

random which the witness himself had made to use on his examination before the committee to refresh his memory. This was taken by Mr. Blaine, and this also he refused to deliver.

Mr. Frye. Will the gentleman pardon me again for interrupting him?

Mr. Hunton. Certainly.

Mr. Frye. Do I understand the gentleman as stating that Mr. Mulligan testified that he demanded in addition to the letters the private memorandum?

Mr. Hunton. No, sir. He said that Mr. Blaine took it when the letters were handed to him. The memorandum was with the letters when they were handed to him.

Mr. Frye. It was in the bundle?

Mr. Hunton. That may be.

Mr. Frye. Was it so?

Mr. Hunton. I think it was. And when Mr. Blaine refused to deliver the letters he refused also to deliver the memorandum.

Now this was the statement made by the witness before the committee charged with the investigation of these subjects. Who has a right to complain? The gentleman from Maine or the committee? Who has a right to complain?

The gentleman from Maine or this House? Here was a witness summoned from Boston. He did not appear as a volunteer in the case. He came under the compulsory process of the House, and was entitled to the protection of the House as long as he was in the city of Washington under his subpoena.

The authority of this House in bringing witnesses here to testify to subject-matters of inquiry which the House has thought proper to make to be protected or not? It is a question which covers this House more than the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman.

But the gentleman from Maine says these were his letters. Why, sir, it is an utter mistake. I say to this House without the aid of successful refutation that according to the well-settled principles of law those letters belonged to Mr. Warren Fisher from the time he received them from the mail until he delivered them over to Mr. Mulligan, and Mr. Mulligan was entitled to the possession and ownership of those letters from that period.

In regard to how Mr. Mulligan got possession of those letters, he says, and Mr. Fisher corroborates his statement, that those letters were taken possession of and brought to the city of Washington by James Mulligan with the full consent and approbation of Warren Fisher. There was no surreptitious possession of these letters on the part of the witness, but they were brought here with the knowledge and consent of Warren Fisher, and witness brought them for the purpose of sustaining his testimony on the stand if it became necessary to use them.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that from the very moment Warren Fisher received those letters from Mr. Blaine, Mr. Blaine ceased to have any control of them. He had no more right to the possession or control of those letters than he has to my watch now in my pocket, or any other piece of property which I may own. Some of the authorities go so far as to say that the publication of private correspondence may be enjoined by the writer or author of the correspondence if it is attempted on the part of the holder to use that correspondence to the detriment of the writer's property. But until that is attempted or threatened the writer has no right to interfere with any sort of use that the recipient of those letters chooses to make of them.

I will not go further into this question, because my friend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. Knott], is fortified with authorities on this subject and will state the law more clearly than I can. But if Mr. Blaine—as I have said the law declares—was not entitled to the possession and had no right to the letters, how can he justify his course before this House in taking the letters under a promise on his honor to return them and then withhold them?

Well, the subcommittee thought that, as the letters were obtained by Mr. Blaine under circumstances such as I have detailed, it was right and proper that they should be given up to the committee or returned to the witness, the rightful owner of these letters; and when the demand was made upon Mr. Blaine for the production of them he asked for time to consult counsel. His demand was cheerfully granted, and an adjournment took place from that day until ten o'clock the next morning.

At ten o'clock the next morning we heard from Mr. Blaine that he had not gotten through with the consultation; that owing to peculiar circumstances he had not been able to get the letters together the preceding night. We gave him until twelve o'clock. Twelve o'clock came before the subcommittee with the opinion of Judge Black and Mr. Carpenter stating that we had no right to demand these letters; that they were private property pertaining to the private business of Mr. Blaine; and that we had no right to demand them, and Mr. Blaine should resist the demand.

Now, the committee may have very high respect for the authority of Judge Black and Mr. Carpenter, but they were investigating a question for the House, and not according to the rules prescribed by Mr. Carpenter and Judge Black. They did not choose that Mr. Carpenter and Judge Black should decide a question which the House had ordered them to decide.

Mr. Frye. Will the gentleman allow me a question?